IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CATHY D. BROOKS-MCCOLLUM : MISCELLANEOUS ACTION

:

WAYNE BERRY et al. : NO. 02-MC-134

v.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 11th day of December, 2002, upon consideration of Brooks-McCollum's unopposed <u>pro se</u> "appeal of all recorded orders & pending orders in bankruptcy action 00-31544DWS & determinability of fraud" (docket entry # 1), which we have construed as a motion for leave to appeal, <u>see</u> Order of August 9, 2002, and the Court finding that:

- (a) On August 9, 2002, we ordered Brooks-McCollum to file a specific list of orders she seeks leave to appeal as well as copies of those orders;
- (b) Brooks-McCollum complied with our Order by identifying the orders she wishes to appeal and, pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8003(a), she also filed two memoranda outlining the facts of the case and some fifty-one questions to be considered on appeal;
- (c) Defendants have not responded to the motion for leave to appeal;

It is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for leave to appeal is  ${\tt GRANTED.}^1$ 

BY THE COURT:

If Brooks-McCollum chooses to file her appeal <u>prose</u>, she must familiarize herself with the relevant rules of procedure as well as the standards of review that will govern our disposition of the appeal. <u>See</u>, <u>e.g.</u>, <u>In re Trans World Airlines</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, 145 F.3d 124, 130-31 (3d Cir. 1998) (outlining standard of review).

Stewart Dalzell, J.